



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tasm cannot take a figure."* Here Tertullian distinctly asserts that the Eucharistic bread is the figure of Christ's actual body, not that body itself, and so, while engaged in a totally different controversy, testifies in the most decisive manner against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Again, in the third book of the same treatise, arguing against Marcion's notion that Christ's body was not real, Tertullian appeals to the evidence of the senses, contending that Christ's reality "was attested by three of them, the sight, the touch, and the hearing."¹ This would have been very inconclusive reasoning if Marcion could have turned upon him and said, as he might have done if the doctrine of Transubstantiation were then held by the Church, "The bread and wine of the Eucharist are also attested by three of the senses, and yet you do not believe them to be really present in it." Here, again, the actual matter in dispute was something quite different from the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and yet we gather from Tertullian's words clear incidental evidence against that doctrine.

It would not be difficult to multiply proofs of the same kind against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. But our space at present forbids it; and we shall conclude this subject with just glancing at the evidence supplied by Justin Martyr, who wrote about the middle of the second century. He speaks (Dialog. § 117) of the elements in the Eucharist as food, liquid and solid; as memorials of Christ's body and blood (§ 70); and as oblations of fruits of the earth (§ 41).

As a second illustration of our general principle let us take the *Worship of Images*.

There is no tract of any early Father, which, from its title, would lead us to expect any reference to this question of image worship; nor do we find anything expressly and directly said about it by the writers of the Primitive Church. Still, we can indirectly avail ourselves of their testimony. For instance, we learn from the Apologies that one of the accusations most commonly brought against the Christians by the heathens was that they were atheists. To this charge Justin Martyr replies at length in his first Apology (§§ 6, 13), and so does Athenagoras in his *Legatio pro Christianis* (§ 10).² The language employed by the latter evidently implies that no such thing as image worship was then known. "I have made it appear," he says, "clearly enough that we are not atheists, accounting, as we do, God to be one, uncreated, everlasting, invisible, impassive, incomprehensible, incapable of being contained within space, comprehended by the mind and reason alone, encompassed with light, and beauty, and spirit, and unutterable power, by whom the universe was created, and set in order, and through whose word it is preserved." The very wording of the defence suggests the real ground of the accusation, namely, that atheism was imputed to the Christians because no images of their gods were to be found in their churches; and, therefore, the heathens supposed that they had no god: a supposition which the apologists endeavour to set aside by showing that their god was invisible, and otherwise of a nature not to be represented by a material image. Indeed, it is their boast, as Origen says, that the meanest and least instructed of the Christians could not be brought to believe that the Deity could be expressed by symbols wrought by the hands of base mechanics; herein proving themselves superior even to the philosophers of the heathen.³ This conclusion is corroborated by another consideration. We learn from Tertullian that the Christians were actually charged with worshipping the cross.⁴ To this he replies, as is not unusual with him, by an argumentum ad hominem. Minucius Felix, who also adverts to it,⁵ retorts it after the manner of Tertullian, though he denies it too.⁶ But whence did the charge originate, except from the cross being the only symbol which the heathens could detect, either within or without the churches, for which the Christians seemed to show any reverence. Had they seen images in the Christian churches, is it conceivable that they would have confined their notice to the cross?

There is also a striking passage in Irenæus, which furnishes us with evidence of the same indirect kind. Speaking of a certain sect of heretics, the followers of Carpocrates, he says, "They call themselves Gnostics, and adopt pictures and images of Christ, alleging that the original was made by Pilate, at the time when Jesus was among men. These they crown with chaplets, and expose them among the figures of the philosophers of this world, such as Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest, treating them with the same kind of reverence as the heathens express for their images."⁷ If the Church of Irenæus's day had been in the habit of presenting pictures and images of the Saviour to the devotions of the people, it is impossible to believe that he would have penned a paragraph like this.

We shall adduce one or two passages from Origen, which plainly, though indirectly, prove that image worship was unknown in the Church of his age. In his treatise on prayer he says, "He who is no hypocrite strips

himself of everything which is adventitious and not his own, . . . and regarding nothing without, and longing for nothing without, and shutting every door of the senses, that he may not be drawn away by them, and that no image of sensible things may get admission into his mind, he prays to the Father, &c."⁸ And in another of his works he thus writes, "Though buffeted by the world, we have learned not to faint or to forfeit our love of the God of the universe in Jesus Christ." Moreover, we distinctly avow our origin, and the dignity thereof, since that we impress upon our converts in the very first instance a contempt for idols and for all images; and elevating their thoughts from serving the creature instead of God, we lead them up to Him who created all things."⁹ Again, "Besides, our faith conspires with the dictates of common sense; as, for example, however perverted custom may have put it into the minds of men, that images are gods, and that objects made of gold, silver, ivory, are worthy of worship, still common sense requires us to believe that perishable matter cannot be God; nor can God be shaped out of senseless blocks, as if they could in any way represent Him."¹⁰ The evasion has, indeed, been pleaded that Origen did not mean to condemn the use of images as incentives to devotion, but only as objects of worship. But the following passage, amongst others, is quite sufficient to refute such an idea—"God, therefore, chose the foolish things of the world—the most simple of the Christians, who had lives more pure and moderate than most of the philosophers—to confound the wise, who do not blush to converse with senseless things as gods, or images of gods. For who that has any understanding would not laugh at him, who, after so many fine philosophical speeches about God or the gods, fixes his eye on their images, and either puts up his prayers to them, or by means of the sight of them carries his thoughts up to the ideal Being, to whom, as he pictures to himself, they must needs ascend from the visible and symbolical figure."¹¹

Our last illustration shall be, *Prayers in an unknown tongue*.

That the idea of having public prayer and the administration of the sacraments conducted in a language not understood by the people never entered the heads of the early Fathers is sufficiently proved by the following statements of Origen in his work against Celsus. He is defending the language of Scripture against Celsus, who describes many of its maxims as not only common to the Greeks, but as having been better expressed by them. "If a Greek," Origen says, "desired to assist those who spoke Egyptian or Syriac by sound teaching, he would first take care to learn the dialects of those who were to be his hearers; and, as the Greeks say, would rather barbarize his own tongue for the sake of improving the Egyptians and Syrians, than be a Greek, and speak in a manner that would be useless to Egyptians and Syrians: so Divine Providence having respect not merely to Greeks of education, but to all others, condescended to the boorishness of the mass of hearers, in order that, making use of such language as they were accustomed to, it might provoke the multitude to listen; who, after this introduction, would be able to advance from the simple element to the comprehension of the deeper meanings which Scripture contained."¹² Again, in another passage even still more to the point, Celsus having imputed to the Christians, whom he confounds with some other class of worshippers, a practice of invoking angels by certain barbarous names, and so acquiring favour with them, Origen replies, "Be assured that the Christians do not universally use in their prayers even the words which are found in the Holy Scriptures, and are of God's appointment; but the Greeks use Grecian words, and the Romans Roman words, and thus each prays to God in his own language, and praises Him according to his power. And He who is Lord of all languages hears those who pray in all languages, as though He heard, if I may so express myself, only one and the same voice uttering its meanings in many tongues."¹³ This is an indirect but a most complete proof that the Church of Origen's day did not hold that Public Prayers ought to be said in a tongue unknown to the people.

The instances already adduced will serve to illustrate the point to which we desire to direct the special attention of our readers. It is one of very great importance, and admits of endless applications in the great controversy in which we are engaged. When a witness, speaking on one subject, makes statements which, wholly unconsciously to himself, bear upon and illustrate another, his evidence, being undesigned, is justly regarded as most valuable. Such witnesses are the Fathers, in reference to most of the points at issue between the Reformers and the Church of Rome.

THE GRANDMOTHER OF GOD.

THE London papers lately, in their accounts of the progress of the Emperor of the French through his provinces, make mention of his visit to a shrine of St. Anne in Brittany, and publish a portion of the hymn sung on the occasion in honour of that saint, who, having been the mother of the Virgin Mary, is addressed in the hymn as grandmother of God. We were really ignorant whether

or not such a title was in common use in this country, or whether it would seem to the ears of Irish Roman Catholics as revolting as it did to ours. We are inclined to believe that Irish Roman Catholics are not yet prepared to accept such an appellation, and we ground our belief on the following circumstance. It would seem that the same hymn which had attracted our attention was copied into the *Cork Constitution*; for we lately saw a number of that paper, in which a correspondent (we presume a Roman Catholic) writes very angrily, accusing the editor of irreverence to the Virgin Mary, and of ignorance as well, in translating the French words, which the writer assumes to have been "grande mère de Dieu," grandmother of God, instead of, as they ought to have been, great mother of God. The editor declined to take any responsibility in the matter, the translation not having been any work of his, but copied, as we said, from one of the London papers. But if the editor had been so disposed, he could have had no difficulty in showing that it was his correspondent and not he who had been guilty of a blunder. In fact, if this correspondent had not been too angry to look at the matter carefully, he would have seen that the hymn in question was addressed, not to the Virgin Mary, but to St. Anne. And he must have known that St. Anne could not possibly have been addressed as the great mother of God—a title to which she had no manner of claim, though the title grandmother of God is one which, on Roman Catholic principles, is fully her right. The Roman Catholic correspondent of the *Cork Constitution* felt, no doubt, as any man's natural reason would tell him, that such a phrase as God's grandmother is absurd and blasphemous, and he imagined that to represent those of his faith as using such a title could only be a deliberate attempt to cover his creed with ridicule. But what is really absurd and ridiculous requires no unfair caricature to make it appear so. The best way of exposing those who are really guilty of absurdity is, if it is possible, to hold a mirror up to them and make them see themselves precisely as they are.

Now, this is simply what has been done in the present case. For how do Roman Catholics justify their use of the phrase mother of God except by relying on the truth that the Virgin Mary was mother of Jesus Christ, who is God. But Jesus in His human nature had not only a mother, but also a grandmother and a grandfather, great grandmothers and grandfathers, nephews, nieces, and so on. Whatever reason there is for using the phrase, God's mother, there is precisely the same for speaking of God's grandmother and grandfather, God's great grandfather and great grandmother, God's nephews and nieces, and other relatives. No reasonable man, then, can suppose that any one is trying to cast unfair ridicule on Roman Catholics by representing them as speaking of "God's grandmother." We have no reason to doubt that the newspapers are correct in saying that the phrase was used in France the other day, for it is one which, on Roman Catholic principles, ought to be used; and we have no doubt that if the question were formally proposed to the leading divines of the Roman Catholic Church, they would declare in favour of the strict orthodoxy of the title.

But we appeal from them to men's natural sense and reason. It is impossible not to feel that such an expression as God's grandmother is absurd and blasphemous, and that if the use of the title, grandmother of God, is a logical consequence of the use of the title, mother of God, the one is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the other. The same absurdity and blasphemy is contained in both, though, from constant repetition, men's ears are blunted to it in the latter case. The truth is, that it is an impropriety of language to apply to the Divine nature of our Lord epithets which are true of His human nature only. As God, our blessed Lord existed from all eternity; as man, He was conceived in the womb of the Virgin, and He died on the cross a death of shame. But though Jesus died and was born, it is impossible that God can have beginning of days or end of life. There was a time, however, in which the orthodox made it a point to avoid strict accuracy of language in this matter, and applied, indiscriminately, to either nature phrases or expressions in strict propriety only applicable to the other. The reason of this was the rise of a sect of heretics called Nestorians, who separated our blessed Lord into two persons, and who taught that Jesus, who was born and died, was not the same Person as the eternal God who resided in Him. In opposition to these the orthodox took pleasure in using language which should most plainly indicate the opposite sentiments, and spoke of God being born, God dying, &c. It was then, too, that the word Theotokos first came into use—a word, however, which, in a former number, we showed is by no means the equivalent of the modern phrase, mother of God (see CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. vi., p. 65). The history of this controversy shows how the safeguards provided against one form of error may, if care be not taken, lead to error of a different kind, after the error against which they were originally designed had died away. So it has been here, and epithets such as Theotokos have been used for the exaltation of a creature, the original intention of which was only to declare the majesty which our blessed Lord, in His one person, is entitled to claim.

It is not merely with respect to the title applied to St. Anne that the hymn which has given rise to this article appears to us worthy of attention. For it may, possibly,

* Tertullian here refers to the denial by Marcion of the reality of Christ's flesh: this he was compelled to deny, because if he admitted it he should also admit the reality of his birth, and consequently his connexion with the Demiurge, the author of the human body or flesh.

¹ Adv. Marc. 3, c. 12.

² Athenagoras wrote towards the end of the second century.

³ Origen, *cont. Celsum*, vi., sec. 14, et alib.

⁴ Tertullian, *Apol.* c. xvi.

⁵ Min. Fel. *Octav.* c. xii.

⁶ C. xxix.

⁷ Irenæus, l. c. xxy. sec. 6, p. 105, Ben. Ed.

⁸ Origen, *de oratione*, sec. 20.

⁹ *Cont. Celsum*, iii., sec. 15.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, sec. 40.

¹¹ *Ibid.* vi., sec. 44.

¹² Origen, *Cont. Celsum*, vii., sec. 60.

¹³ *Ibid.* viii., sec. 37.

be amongst the precursors of the next phase of the Roman Catholic religion. It was reserved for the present century completely to dissipate the illusion that the Roman Catholic religion has been always the same. A hundred years ago, Protestants pointed out the inconsistencies of Roman Catholic teaching, and the difference between her modern teaching and the language of the early fathers of the Church, while the defenders of Romanism wearied themselves to explain the inconsistency away. Now the ground is changed; the defenders of Romanism no longer pretend that their Church has always been the same. What we call corruption they call development; and in their zeal for their new principle, some of them have been eager to make concessions, in our opinion, not only destructive of their own peculiar tenets, but subversive of the great truths which they and we hold in common. Thus, Dr. Newman seems desirous to represent the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity as a discovery of the fourth century, and he even speaks as if the elevation of our blessed Lord had left a "throne vacant in Heaven," to which the Virgin Mary had since been elevated. In the name of our common orthodoxy we protest against such a doctrine; but it is plain enough that if we once grant that the Church of the fourth century had a right to honour our Lord Jesus with the honour due to God alone, even though such claims on His behalf had been unknown to the Church of former days, we cannot deny similar rights to the Church of any following century. They may at any time invent new objects of worship, and we have no security into what shapes our religion may not be corrupted or "developed." It cannot be denied that the great characteristic of modern Romanism has been the exaltation of the Virgin Mary. Even within the last quarter of a century this species of devotion has made rapid strides, as any one may judge by comparing the space which she occupies in any pastoral of a Roman Catholic Pope or Bishop now with that which would be taken up with mention of her in a similar document fifty years ago; and we have seen very lately her immaculate conception acknowledged with little opposition—a dogma to which the Church of Rome had never ventured to pledge itself before. It seems to us, too, as well as a Protestant can judge, that devotion to saints has decidedly declined in the Roman Catholic Church, as the worship of the Virgin has increased. In fact, just as a Protestant does not care to have recourse to the mediation of saints because he has faith in God's infinite willingness to hear and answer petitions addressed to Him in the name of our Lord, so a Roman Catholic who has learned to look to the Virgin as an ever present source of help cares little to have recourse to less powerful intercessors. So it was stated some time ago that the island of Malta, which has for many centuries delighted in recognizing the Apostle Paul as its patron saint (he having been shipwrecked on that island), had placed itself now under the protection of the Blessed Virgin; and the newspapers two or three years ago asserted that some of the Irish dioceses had, in like manner, resolved to exchange the patronage of St. Patrick for the patronage of the Virgin Mary. However this may be, it is certain that the Church of Rome can now go very little further than she has done in the way of paying honour to the Blessed Virgin. Except in more freely applying to her the name of God, we know nothing that can be done; for we are ourselves unable to distinguish from divine the honour which is actually paid to her.

What, then, is to be the next phase of Romanism? Is no further change to take place? Dr. Newman and his school will certainly not maintain that it is the exclusive right of the Church of bygone days to make developments; nor will they assert that posterity are obliged to continue, without the slightest variation, the peculiar type of doctrine which exists in the present day. It is lawful, then, for any one to express his conjectures as to the direction in which the next change is likely to take place, and so we may be indulged in making our own guesses as to the peculiarities of Romanism two centuries hence, if it shall exist so long.

It appears to us, then, that the exaltation of the Virgin Mary took its origin in too exclusive regard to the Divine nature of Him whom Scripture has declared to be the only mediator between God and man. It was not kept in mind that He was man as God, endued with our own nature, able to sympathize with every human want and desire, willing and able to help to the uttermost all that came to Him. And so men had recourse to the mediation of the Virgin Mary, as one whom they regarded as certainly of their own nature, as more loving and merciful and compassionate, and better able to sympathize with human frailties. But if what we must call the deification of the Virgin Mary goes on as it has done, the next step will be that she will be exalted so high that men will cease to have confidence in her willingness to condescend to listen to them, and they will seek for intercessors with her, just as she has been sought as an intercessor with her Son. We do not know any one who may more naturally be chosen as such an intercessor than her own mother, to whom tradition gives the name of St. Anne. Surely the Virgin Mary would not be deficient in filial respect, and the desires of her mother would be commands for her. If any one had enlisted on his behalf the patronage of St. Anne, might he not fairly reckon that St. Anne would obtain for him also all the

assistance which the Virgin was able to render. We do not know a single argument which has ever been used for employing the intercession of the Virgin Mary as a mother with her Son which does not apply equally well to employing the intercession of St. Anne with her daughter. And as the principle of development finds no difficulty in discovering new facts, we see no improbability in the supposition that the immaculate conception of St. Anne may be one day declared to be an article of the Roman Catholic faith. The supposition is certainly by no means so improbable now as it would have been four hundred years ago, that the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, about which it was owned that the Church had no tradition then, should ever be declared an article of the Christian faith. There is, in short, no proof from tradition of either doctrine, and whatever arguments from reason have been alleged in support of the immaculate conception of St. Mary apply equally to the immaculate conception of St. Anne. If it is incredible that she who gave birth to our Lord could ever have been tainted with sin, and so deserving of the Divine wrath, it will be soon felt to be incredible, too, that she who gave birth to one so pure as the Virgin Mary should have been herself the subject of impurity and exposed to God's displeasure.

St. Bernard long ago, in his memorable letter to the canons of Lyons (epistle 174), made this objection to celebrating, by a feast, the conception of the Virgin Mary, that on the same principles there would be no reason why we should not celebrate the conception of each of her parents, and then of her grandfathers and grandmothers, and so on, so that there would be no end of feasts. And, his argument applies equally to the notion of the conception being immaculate as well as to the celebration of it by a feast. Whatever reason there is in the case of the Virgin Mary herself applies as forcibly in the case of her mother and her grandmother. It seems to us, then, far from incredible that when men's minds are ripe for it, the immaculate conception of St. Anne may be declared to be a doctrine of the Roman faith; that St. Anne may be regarded as the principal intercessor in behalf of Christians; that she may be worshipped with peculiar titles of honour, and that the title grandmother of God may become as common as the title of mother of God is now. It is for this reason that we have thought the hymn to St. Anne, which gave rise to this article, a sign of the times worth paying attention to, since it may chance to be one of the first steps of devotion in a new direction, in which possibly the devotion of Roman Catholics of the next century may run.

DR. CULLEN'S LAST PASTORAL.

THE *Tablet* newspaper of August 7, 1858, gives extracts from a "Pastoral letter of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen to the Catholic clergy and laity of the Diocese of Dublin," which was read in the several churches and chapels of the diocese on the previous Sunday, August 1st.

If there be anything about which a Christian Bishop should be carefully anxious, it should be about the truth of a letter which he intends to be read in the public worship of some hundred congregations, before some hundred thousand Christian worshippers, and which he hopes will be received as Gospel by them, on the authority of his office. A Christian Bishop cannot be too anxious that such a letter should be founded in truth.

Neither can the people in such congregations be too anxious that such a letter should be founded in truth. If such a letter, under circumstances so solemn, should have no foundation in truth, no evidence which could lead the writer himself to suppose it to be true, then how fearful the delusion—how great the danger of the deluder and the deluded?

In writing thus we do not assume that the Pastoral letter of Dr. Cullen has no foundation in truth, we only point out the importance of its truth being capable of proof. Such a letter ought to be capable of proof that it is founded in truth; and that proof ought to be forthcoming. Our introductory observations are merely meant for a justification for asking for such proof.

Dr. Cullen's Pastoral letter is about "the assumption of the holy Virgin Mary into Heaven."

"Assumption" is a word derived from the Latin, and means "taking up." Dr. Cullen writes upon the Virgin Mary having been taken up into heaven; and we ask is it a fact, or can it be proved, that she was taken up into heaven?

Dr. Cullen says, "Whilst heaven and earth exult in the glorious assumption of the mother of God into heaven, it behoves us to celebrate so great a festival with becoming dispositions, &c."

On this we beg to ask, 1st—Did it behove the Church of God in all ages to celebrate so glorious a festival? and 2nd—Did the Church of God ever celebrate that festival for a THOUSAND YEARS after the death of the Virgin? Now, we don't mean to say that the Church did not. We only mean to ask, "Did she?" and we hope for an answer

from Dr. Cullen or some one else. Surely the question deserves an answer, showing when the Church began to do it.

And next, we mean to ask, WHAT was the blessed Virgin? Don't let our readers suppose that we mean any irreverent question. Surely we do not. But WHAT was the Blessed Virgin? Was she a mere body without a soul? Was she merely a soul without a body? Or was she a being composed of body and soul?

We believe that the Blessed Virgin was composed of body and soul. We call her blessed, as the mother of our Lord. We know nothing of the beauty of her earthly body, because nothing is told us. We know that her Blessed Son had "no beauty that we should desire Him."^a We, therefore, think it possible that she may have been plain also. But for her soul, we have her own inspired testimony, "My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour;"^b and (without believing in the "immaculate conception," which the very mention of a "Saviour" disproves) we readily believe that no human spirit ever rejoiced in a greater degree in that purity which the blood of Jesus Christ produces in the cleansing from all sin. We trust our Roman Catholic readers will see no irreverence in this. But we return to our question—"WHAT was the Blessed Virgin?" We answer again, "A being composed of body and soul."

Can Dr. Cullen answer so when he speaks of "the glorious assumption of the mother of God into heaven?" Was it the assumption of body and soul?

When we witness the departure of a beloved friend, what do we think of what remains? Is that cold corpse the being that we loved? Corruption would correct our error, if we thought so. That being was body and soul. The soul was returned to Him who gave it; the body must return to dust. The mere body is not the being we loved. What, then, was "the assumption of the Blessed Virgin?" Was it the taking up of the Blessed Virgin, body and soul, into Heaven? No, indeed. Dr. Cullen cannot say this yet, because there is no "decree of the Pope." So far as Dr. Cullen yet knows, the Blessed Virgin did really die. Here is the root of our argument and difference with Dr. Cullen about "the assumption." As to the soul of the Blessed Virgin, we believe that it is "present with the Lord."^c Our only difference is about her body, which we believe to be awaiting the resurrection of the just; but which Dr. Cullen asserts to have been taken up into Heaven.

Our readers may now see the meaning of our question—"WHAT is the Blessed Virgin?" Surely, not a mere dead body! If Dr. Cullen believes that that which was "taken up" was the dead body only, without the soul, let him in future speak of "the assumption of the dead body of the Virgin;" which is all that his Church yet authorises him to believe.

Our belief respecting the body of the Virgin is founded not merely upon the silence of Scripture, and the ignorance of the Apostles and Fathers of all the early ages, respecting the assumption, but on the positive testimony of Scripture. Speaking of the resurrection, St. Paul says, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every one in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming."^d This would not have been true of every one, if one had already risen before St. Paul wrote. No account of the death of the Virgin fixes it so late as the writing of this Epistle. Could St. Paul have written this if he had known that the Blessed Virgin had already risen before the coming of Christ?

On what authority or proof does Dr. Cullen rest his assertion that the body of the Virgin has been taken up into heaven? Certainly not on the Scriptures. St. John says that after our Lord's death "that disciple" took the Virgin to his own home.^e St. Luke says, that in the days that followed, before the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, she "continued in prayer and supplication" with the other disciples.^f This is all the inspired writers thought fit to relate concerning her. After her death St. John wrote three epistles and the book of Revelation, yet he never mentions her. Would Dr. Cullen have done the same in the like case? If he had taken the blessed Virgin home, and she had lived with him till her death, and that he had survived her some 40 or 50 years, would he have gone down to the grave himself without having even written one line to the Church concerning her? If Dr. Cullen had been in the place of St. John, what a flaming pastoral we should have had in the Bible! Is there not a contrast between the magniloquence of Dr. Cullen and the silence of that Apostle who cherished with pious care the holy life of the Virgin?

But on what grounds does Dr. Cullen believe the stories in his own letter, which he never learned from St. John? Our readers will find the whole of the evidence in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., No. 33, p. 103; and vol. vi., No. 69, p. 98, of which we can only give a summary here.

The Church and the Fathers of the first five centuries were wholly ignorant of the story of the assumption. Let

^a "Quid adhuc addendum tuis putamus honoribus? Ut honoretur, inquit, et conceptus, qui honorandam prævit parum; quoniam si ille non præcessisset, nec iste esset qui honoratur. Quid aliud, propter candorem causam, etiam utrique parenti ejus festos honores assensu deferendum? Sed de avis et proavis idipsum posset pro simili causa quilibet flagitare; et sic tenderetur in infinitum; et festorum non esset numerus."—Ben. ed. Paris, 1713. Vol. I. p. 171.

^b Isaiah liii. 2.

^c Luke i. 47.

^d 1 Cor. xv. 8.

^e John xix. 27.

^f Acts i. 14.